

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/615,685	07/09/2003	Navin B. Shah	A01304	9809	
21898	7590 04/03/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	HAAS COMPANY		FLETCHER III, WILLIAM P		
PATENT DEPARTMENT 100 INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	HIA, PA 19106-2399		1762		

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				1/~		
•		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/615,685	SHAH ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		William P. Fletcher III	1762			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication approximation of Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence addres	SS		
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS tte, cause the application to become ABAND	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this commu DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·		
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09	July 2003.				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
3)	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application	n.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.				
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	ccepted or b) objected to by t	the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
-	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	, ,,,	•	. ,		
11)[]	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Of	ffice Action or form PTO-1	52.		
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).			
	1. Certified copies of the priority documer					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	-	eived in this National Stag	ge		
* (application from the International Bure		-5			
	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not rec	eivea.			
Attachmen	tic\					
_	us) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sumr	mary (PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Ma	ail Date			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	nal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-6, drawn to a coating powder, classified in class 520, subclass various.
 - II. Claims 7-10, drawn to a process for coating an article, classified in class 427, subclass 189.
 - III. Claim 11, drawn to an article, classified in class 428, subclass 411.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the process can be performed with a materially different composition: a process in which the composition contains other than an epoxy-functional <u>curing</u> agent. Further, the composition can be used in a materially different process: extrusion-forming a unitary, unsupported (i.e., no substrate) polymeric film.
- 3. Inventions II and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the

product as claimed can be made by a process in which a pre-formed sheet of resinous material is bonded or adhesively applied to the substrate. See MPEP 2113.

- 4. Inventions I and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful in the formation of extrusion-forming a unitary, unsupported (i.e., no substrate) polymeric film and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.
- 5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and Art Unit: 1762

specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

9. The prompt development of clear issues in the prosecution history requires that applicant's reply to this Office action be fully responsive (MPEP § 714.02). When filing an amendment, applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including new or amended claims (MPEP §§ 714.02 & 2163). A fully responsive reply to this Office action, if it includes new or amended claims, must therefore include an explicit citation (i.e., page number and line number) of that/those portion(s) of the original disclosure which applicant contends support(s) the new or amended limitation(s).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Fletcher III whose telephone number is (571) 272-1419. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). 3/29/2006

William Phillip Fletcher III Patent Examiner, USPTO

Art Unit 1762